Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1 and 5-13 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 11-13 have been amended. Claims 2-4 have been cancelled.

In the third paragraph on page 2 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 1, 12, and 13 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Minoura et al. (US Pat. No. 4,253,724) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The rejection has been noted and claims 1, 12, and 13 have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found on page 10, lines 16-19 of the specification as well as original claim 4.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1, 12, and 13 call for, inter alia:

> at least one semiconductor laser being supplied with a current using DC and AC components, being operated in multimode, being mode coupled and emitting laser radiation having ultra-short pulses with a duration of less than 1 ns. (Emphasis added.)

As the Examiner has stated in the last paragraph on page 3 of the final Office action, Minoura et al. do not disclose that one laser has a supply current with AC and DC components. APA does not make up this feature.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the feature "at least one semiconductor laser being supplied with a current using DC and AC components" of claims 1, 12, and 13. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art.

In the fourth paragraph on page 3 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 4, 9, and 10 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Minoura et al. in view of APA and further in view of Rothrock (US Pat. No. 3,657,510) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 4 has been cancelled and the feature of claim 4 has been added to claims 1, 12, and 13 respectively.

As discussed above, neither Minoura et al. nor APA disclose a semiconductor laser being supplied with a current using AC and DC components.

In contrast to the Examiner's statement in the first paragraph on page 4 of the Office action, Rothrock does not disclose a semiconductor laser being supplied with AC and DC components (which is an electrically pumped laser system) but only an optically pumped (via a flash lamp) solid state laser system (see column 2, lines 3-5 of Rothrock).

A person skilled in the art can also not obtain any hint from Rothrock that a semiconductor laser can be supplied with AC and DC components.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 12, and 13. Claims 1, 12, and 13 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since claims 9-10 are dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In the third paragraph on page 4 of the above-mentioned Office action, claim 8 has been rejected as being unpatentable over Minoura et al. in view of APA and further in view of Huber (US Pat. No. 5,208,819) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the art. Since claim 8 is dependent on claim 1, it is believed to be patentable as well.

In the third paragraph on page 5 of the above-mentioned Office action, claims 5-7 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Minoura et al. in view of APA and further in view of Rothrock and further in view of Haas (US Pat. No. 5,874,981) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As discussed above, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over the art. Since claims 5-7 are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

With regard to the Examiner's Response to Arguments on page 6 of the Office action, Minoura et al. do not disclose in the section "Description of Prior Art" a semiconductor laser emitting short pulses. A modulator in the light path according to Fig. 1 of Minoura et al. is not a device for producing short pulses but an intensity attenuator or shutter. A modulator produces interrupted continuous-wave laser radiation but does not lead to a pulsed laser system.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 5-13 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made. Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

For Applicant

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
REG. NO. 29,308

YHC:cgm

July 15, 2003

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101